



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,090	01/02/2004	Robert Culbert	S002-P03047US	1316

33356 7590 08/09/2005
SoCAL IP LAW GROUP LLP
310 N. WESTLAKE BLVD. STE 120
WESTLAKE VILLAGE, CA 91362

EXAMINER

TSIDULKO, MARK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2875

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/751,090

Applicant(s)

CULBERT ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Tsidulko

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 11, 13, 19, 20 and 22-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-10, 12, 14-18, 21 and 26-30 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 010204.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “*lamp holder*” (claim 5) must be shown with the reference character or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The Abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of using claim language: “**comprise**” (line 2) should be changed to “**has**” and “**comprising**” (lines 4 and 6) should be changed to “**having**”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 11, 13, 19, 20, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russel et al. (US 2004/0161371).

Referring to Claim 1 Russel et al. disclose (Figs.2-4) an apparatus for radiation lamp including:

- a housing [24] providing mechanical support;
- a socket ([16]+[20]+[22]) attached to the housing with screws [31] and having an electrical contacts [46] electrically connected to a power supply [23];
- a lamp [14] having a single wall envelop [14a], a base [15] attached to the envelop, a vaporizable material sealed in the envelop (page 4, [0045]), an electrodes [8] and [9] disposed in the envelop, the electrical contacts [17] attached

Art Unit: 2875

to the base and electrically connected to the electrodes, whereby the lamp is mechanically supported by the socket.

- a cover [18] made of material resistant to a liquid (page 3, [0043]), having a cavity (not indicated by number) that surrounding the base and the socket (playing role of first and second sections), the inner surface (surface of the cavity) surrounding the electrical contact of the socket and the electrical contact of the base, an outer surface of the cover [18] shields the electrical contacts of the socket and the base.

Referring to Claims 4, 20 Russel et al. disclose a germicidal lamp (col.3, [0042]).

Referring to Claim 5 Russel et al. disclose (Fig.4) a lamp holder [22] attached to the flange [16].

Referring to Claim 11, 19 since Russel et al. disclose that the air is passing through the conduit, it is understood, that a water condensate from the air could be in a contact with the parts of the device.

Referring to Claim 13 since Russel et al. disclose (Figs.2-4A) a cover [18] made of material resistant to a liquid (page 3, [0043]), having a cavity (not indicated by number) that surrounding the base and the socket (playing role of first and second sections), the inner surface (surface of the cavity) surrounding the electrical contact of the socket and the electrical contact of the base, an outer surface of the cover [18] shields the electrical contacts of the socket and the base.

Art Unit: 2875

Referring to Claim 22 since Russel et al. disclose (Fig.4) a four-pin socket. It is understood that the condensate may be composed from a water and an oil, in this case the cover must be made of oil and water resistant material.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to provide the cover made of water and oil resistant material, in order to obtain good environmental resistance.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russel et al. (US 2004/0161371) in view of Snowball (US 4,762,613).

Russel et al. discloses the instant claimed invention except for a power source disposed in the housing.

Snowball discloses (Fig.1) a water purifier wherein a power source [24] is disposed in the housing [2]. Providing the power source maximum close to the power consumer, allow decrease the length of the wiring and obtain a compact device.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to provide the power source disposed in the housing, as taught by Snowball, for the device of Russel et al., in order to obtain a compact device.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russel et al. (US 2004/0161371) in view of Chen et al. (US 6,580,228).

Russel et al. discloses the instant claimed invention except for a power source disposed inside of the base.

Art Unit: 2875

Chen et al. disclose a power source disposed inside of the base of the lamp (col.3, lines 6,7).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to provide the power source disposed inside of the base of the lamp of the device of Russel et al., as taught by Chen et al., in order to decrease the size of the device.

Claims 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russel et al., Snowball and Chen et al. These references in a combination disclose structure of the device but do not disclose a process for providing environmental resistance to a germicidal system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to take the steps of apparatus above and provide a process for providing environmental resistance since a prior art of record teaches or suggests a means of environmental resistance.

Referring to Claim 23 positioning a cavity of the cover which play role of a first and a second sections around the base of the lamp and a socket of the device, positioning electrical contact of the base with electrical contact of the socket, whereby the cover shields the electrical contacts of the base and the socket.

Referring to Claim 24 positioning the base to engage the socket.

Referring to Claim 25 positioning the cover to surround the base and the socket.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-10, 12, 14-18, 21, 26-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Referring to Claims 6, 12 the prior art of record fails to show a resistant lamp system wherein the first section partially abuts the base.

Referring to Claims 7, 9 the prior art of record fails to show a resistant lamp system wherein the first section partially interlocks with the base.

Referring to Claims 8, 10 the prior art of record fails to show a resistant lamp system wherein the first section partially seals to the base.

Referring to Claim 14 the prior art of record fails to show a resistant cover wherein a cross section of the inner surface fits with an outer cross section of the base.

Referring to Claims 15, 17, 21 the prior art of record fails to show a resistant cover wherein a cross section of the inner surface interlocks with an outer cross section of the base.

Referring to Claims 16, 18 the prior art of record fails to show a resistant cover wherein a cross section of the inner surface seals to the outer cross section of the base.

Referring to Claims 26, 29, 30 the prior art of record fails to show a resistant lamp system wherein the cover partially abuts the base.

Referring to Claim 27 the prior art of record fails to show a resistant lamp system wherein the cover partially interlocks with the base.

Art Unit: 2875

Referring to Claim 28 the prior art of record fails to show a resistant lamp system wherein the cover partially seals to the base.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Tsidulko whose telephone number is (571)272-2384. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for all communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.T.
July 29, 2005



**JOHN ANTHONY WARD
PRIMARY EXAMINER**